

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Office Action, Claims 51, 52 and 53 were amended. Claims 54, 55 and 56 were added.

It is respectfully requested that the Attorney Docket Number in this application be changed to read: MESH008.

#### **Rejection of Claims 51 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent no. 6, 396, 814:**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 51 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent 6, 396, 814 as herein amended. Claims 51 and 52 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter is a radio terminal for use within ad-hoc, peer-to-peer multihopping radio system. Further, claims 51 and 52 have been amended to clarify that the radio terminal stores within its memory registration information about an other radio terminal for which said radio terminal serves as a node through which it has been registered for forming a call-connection routing path, and for storing registration information about any descendent radio terminals for which said other radio terminal serves as a node through which said descendent radio terminals has been registered.

Applicants respectfully submit that US Patent 6,396,814 to Iwamura does not anticipate the subject matter of claims 51 and 52 as herein amended. Specifically, the Iwamura patent presents a method for building routes in a network by “grouping the communication devices belonging to a communication network into one or a plurality of communication groups” (abstract, Claims 1 to 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 22, 23, 26 to 28, col. 6, lines 1-3, col. 7 lines 7-10, col. 8 lines 29-31, ). The method is know in industry as “clustering” and has no relation with the claimed subject matter.

#### **Rejection of Claim 53 under 36 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent no. 6,396,814 in view of US patent no. 6,643,650:**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 53 under 36 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent no. 6,396,814 in view of US patent no. 6,643,650 as herein amended. Claim 53 includes all the limitations as described previously for claims 51 and 52; and further describes that a node that has registered with a neighbor may un-register, when it is necessary.

Applicant respectfully submits that US patent no. 6,396,814 in view of US patent no. 6,643,650 does not anticipate the claimed subject matter of Claim 53. Specifically, the Slaughter patent presents a method for retrieving documents and services from distributed databases. The examiner rejects claim 53 because “Slaughter discloses means for unregistering another radio terminal, which has been registered with it”. In quoted patent the word register has the same meaning as the word subscribe. “In one embodiment the event gate automatically subscribes itself for events on behalf of the local consumer clients. As clients register interest with the gate, the gate registers interest with the event producer service. A client may also un-subscribe interest, which causes the gate to un-register itself with the service producing the event (col. 32, lines 31-36). The client can register or subscribe to a service provided by a space. A service gate assures that services are provide only to those clients that have the right for using them, as some services may be restricted to general access or may be leased. As it can be easily identified, the Slaughter Patent presents methods applicable on distributed databases and services and operates on layers above the network protocols layers. It is in contrast with the claimed subject matter of Claim 53 that addresses the specifics of the Media Access Control layer, thus operating below the network protocols layers. The only similarity between these two methods is the fact that none of them binds to a specific network protocol.

**New Claims:**

Applicants have herein added new claims 54-56. Support for claims 54-56 can be found in Claims 51-53 of Applicants’ originally filed specification. Consequently, claims 54-56 do not introduce any new matter into the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 54-56 are in proper condition for allowance and request that claims 54-56 may now be passed to allowance.

The other references of record have been reviewed and applicant's invention is deemed patentably distinct and nonobvious over each taken alone or in combination.

Inasmuch as this amendment distinguishes all of the applicants' claims over the prior art references, for the many reasons indicated above, passing of this case is now believed to be in order. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc, with any fees which may be required in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

July 3, 2006

Motorola, Inc.  
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard  
Law Department – MD1610  
Plantation, Florida 33322  
Customer Number: 24273

By: /Randi L. Karpinia/  
Randi L. Karpinia, Esq.  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 46,148  
Tel: 954-723-6449  
Fax: 954-723-3871  
E-Mail: [docketing.florida@motorola.com](mailto:docketing.florida@motorola.com)

